

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated March 19, 2007, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on June 19, 2007. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 22-38 remain pending in the application and are shown above. Claims 28 and 35 have been cancelled by Applicant. Claims 22-38 are rejected by the Examiner. Reconsideration of the rejected claims is requested for reasons presented below.

Claims 22 and 32 are amended to clarify the invention, adding the subject matter of claims 28 and 35, respectively. Applicant submits no new matter has been added and respectfully requests entry of the claims as amended.

Claims 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 30, 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Onoe, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,270,839). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection on grounds that the reference *Onoe, et al.* does not teach or suggest the subject matter as claimed.

Applicant submits the reference *Onoe, et al.* teaches an apparatus for feeding raw material for chemical vapor deposition from a container [1] within an oven [7]. Thus, Applicant submits that the reference *Onoe, et al.* does not teach or suggest an apparatus for vaporizing a solid precursor, comprising a housing having an inlet for receiving a carrier gas and an outlet in fluid communication with a sealable interior volume, at least two surfaces comprising a mesh material contained in the housing having a solid chemical precursor applied thereto, wherein the solid chemical precursor includes a tantalum-containing precursor or a tungsten-containing precursor, and a heating member contained within a wall of the housing, wherein at least one of the at least two surfaces is in thermal communication with the wall of the housing, as recited in claim 22. Withdrawal of the rejection to claim 22, and claims dependent thereon, is respectfully requested.

Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Onoe, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,270,839), over admitted prior art or in view of *Suntola, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 4,413,022). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection on grounds

that the reference *Onoe, et al.* alone, or in combination, does not teach, suggest, provide motivation for, or otherwise render obvious, the subject matter of claim 27, which depends indirectly from claim 22. Applicant submits claim 22 is patentable and respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection to claim 27.

Claims 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Onoe, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,270,839) over *Suntola, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 4,413,022) or *Kim* (U.S. Patent No. 6,424,800). Applicant has cancelled claim 28. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Applicant submits that claim 29, which depends from claim 22, is not taught, suggested, or otherwise obvious from *Onoe, et al.* alone, or in combination with, *Suntola, et al.* or *Kim*. Applicant submits the reference *Suntola, et al.* teaches a method for growing thin films from a body [60] having heaters [56, 68] coupled to an outer surface of reactive vapor sources [53, 54] and an outer surface of the body [60], respectively. Applicant submits that the heaters [68] disposed on the outer surface of the body [60] are not taught or suggested as being "contained" in the body [60]. Applicant further submits that the heaters [68] are not in communication with the reactive vapor sources [53, 54] as the reactive vapor sources [53, 54] include separate heaters [56]. Applicant also notes that the heaters [56] are not taught or suggested as being "contained" in any walls or other portions of the body [60], but are merely surrounding reactive vapor sources [53, 54] (see e.g., Figures 8 and 9C, and the description at Column 5, Line 54-Column 6, Line 7).

Applicant submits the reference *Kim* teaches vaporizer chamber [51] having various embodiments of a heater source [73] suspended below a plate [58]. Applicant submits that the reference *Kim* teaches the distance and parallel positioning of the heater source [73] relative to the plate [58] is "... in consideration of the optimum vaporization efficiency of the various sources." (Column 4, Lines 12-21). In view of this teaching, Applicant submits that the reference *Kim* teaches away from any heating element disposed in a wall of the vaporizer chamber [51].

Therefore, Applicant submits claim 22 is patentable over the references *Onoe, et al.*, *Suntola, et al.*, and/or *Kim*, and respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection to claim 29, which depends therefrom.

Claims 32-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over *Onoe, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,270,839), or *Suntola, et al.* (U.S. 4,389,973), in view of *Gartner, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 4,947,790), *Loan, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,296,711) or *Arnold, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,224,202). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection on grounds that the references *Onoe, et al.*, *Suntola, et al.*, *Gartner, et al.*, *Loan, et al.*, and *Arnold, et al.* alone, or in combination, do not teach, suggest, provide motivation for, or otherwise render obvious, the claimed subject matter.

The references *Onoe, et al.* and *Suntola, et al.* are discussed above, and Applicant submits that the references do not teach or suggest an apparatus for vaporizing a solid precursor, comprising a housing having an inlet for receiving a carrier gas and an outlet in fluid communication with a sealable interior volume, at least two cone shaped surfaces contained in the housing having a solid chemical precursor applied thereto, and a heating member contained within a wall of the housing, wherein at least one of the at least two surfaces is in thermal communication with the wall of the housing, as recited in claim 32. Applicant submits that the references *Gartner, et al.*, *Loan, et al.*, and *Arnold, et al.* do not add any limitations not present in the references *Onoe, et al.* or *Suntola, et al.* Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection to claim 32, and claims dependent thereon.

In conclusion, the references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest the invention as claimed.

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Keith M. Tackett
Registration No. 32,008
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844

Facsimile: (713) 623-4846

Attorney for Applicant(s)